

The Rockwood Review.

ogeneous entertainments involving sonatas, hymn singing, pound-cakes, phonographs, prayers, tea and coffee, comic songs, stump speeches, taffy and other instruments of torture. By this means they expected to pass a Bill in Parliament, that would enable them to send a policeman to Lady Van Abbott Strathcona's house in Sherbrooke St., Montreal. He would go up the front steps, deliver a thundering knock on the door, arrest the footman who opened it, and all the other flunkies, then sweep all the Rhinewines and champagnes off the table, take down the names of the guests, and confiscate the stock in the wine-cellar. We presume the butler would be hanged, and perhaps that would be right. But there is no doubt that, reduced to dollars, the Plebiscite was a contest of \$1 against \$1000. In a country like this, that settles the matter for all practical purposes, the actual money status is the substratum of what exists. Why is it that people in Canada do not consider cold money facts? Humbug and hysterics will not achieve anything solid in the way of results. If the so-called intelligent people of Canada would only try to think for themselves a very, very little bit, they might come to the conclusion that the question of alcoholic products and compounds needs to be considered under at least three separate heads. The first relates to the use of fine wines and liquors by the rich people or aristocracy of Canada. The second refers to the use of alcohol in manufactures.

The third refers to the use and abuse of cheap whiskey and bad liquors by the poor farmers, labourers, shantymen and workmen. Each of these three sections requires special legislation for itself, embodied in separate acts or provisions, and enforced by separate officials.

The temperance party as now constituted in Canada is entirely unfitted to consider the first section,

as it is out of its province.

The temperance party has shown itself entirely unfit to consider the second section, because it does not know anything about it.

The third section would be suitable subject for the temperance party to handle, after the leaders had gone through a course of mental health treatment at Rockwood.

R. S. KNIGHT,
Lancaster, Ont.

A LITTLE MISUNDERSTANDING.

A housemaid, after being a short time in her place, gave warning. Her mistress asked her what she had to find fault with—was the work too hard, or what? No; she had nothing to complain of on that score, but she could not stand being prayed at by the master at morning prayers.

Mistress (loquitur)—What on earth do you mean, Mary? Your master does not pray at any one.

"O, yes, he does, marm; he prays at me every day, and I won't stand it any longer."

"What does he say, then?"

"Why he says, 'O Lord, who hatest nothing but the housemaid.'"

Mistress, after a little reflection and further inquiry, ascertains that Mary has thus interpreted "O Lord, who hatest nothing thou hast made."—London Society.
